

t r a n s p o r t a t i o n 2 0 3 0 p l a n



public outreach & involvement program

evaluation report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
--------------------------------	----------

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
-----------------------------	----------

2. SUMMARY OF OUTREACH APPROACH AND ACTIVITIES	3
---	----------

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	7
---------------------------------------	----------

4. KEY FINDINGS	11
------------------------------	-----------

Accessibility	11
---------------------	----

Reach	12
-------------	----

Diversity	14
-----------------	----

Impact.....	15
-------------	----

Participant Satisfaction.....	16
-------------------------------	----

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2009 RTP	19
--	-----------

6. APPENDICES

Evaluation Survey Cover Letter

Evaluation Survey

Evaluation Survey Instrument in Spanish and Vietnamese

Evaluation Survey Results

Comments from the Evaluation Survey

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission wishes to acknowledge the individuals, organizations and agencies listed below for devoting their time and resources to make the Transportation 2030 Public Outreach Program a success.

Evaluation Survey Respondents

More than 100 individuals who responded to the Evaluation Survey

Transportation 2030 Public Outreach and Involvement Consultant Team

Carolyn Verheyen, Moore Iacofano Goltsman (MIG), Inc.
Vikrant Sood, MIG, Inc.
Beth Altshuler, MIG, Inc.
Bruce Riordan, Elmwood Consulting

MTC Public Outreach and Involvement Team

Steve Heminger, Executive Director
Therese McMillan, Deputy Director, Policy
Ann Flemer, Deputy Director, Operations
Randy Rentschler, Manager, Legislation and Public Affairs
Ellen Griffin
Catalina Alvarado
Karin Betts
Joe Curley
John Goodwin
Pam Grove
Brenda Kahn
Peter Beeler
David Cooper
Ethan Michaels
Michele Stone

Transportation 2030 Project Staff

Doug Kimsey, Manager, Planning
Ashley Nguyen, Transportation 2030 Project Manager

Alix Bockelman
Tom Bryan
Melanie Choy
Lisa Klein
James Corless
Jeff Georgevich
Pierce Gould
Al Huerby
Doug Johnson
Valerie Knepper
Therese Knudsen
Nancy Okasaki
Theresa Romell
Connie Soper
Li Zhang

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Transportation 2030 Plan is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) principal long-range planning document. The Plan has a 25-year horizon and specifies investment strategies for maintaining, managing and improving the surface transportation network in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The Plan determines how MTC will spend nearly \$113 billion in transportation funding that is likely to flow into the region between now and 2030 from local, regional, state and federal sources.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

A critical component of the Transportation 2030 Plan development process was a public outreach and involvement program. The 20-month program built on the values, needs and priorities that MTC heard from the public during the previous 12-month public outreach effort for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Transportation 2030 Plan outreach program focused on three specific goals, based on the principles of MTC's Public Involvement Action Plan (March 2001):

- Involve individuals and groups who traditionally have not been involved in transportation planning, in both the development of the Transportation 2030 Plan and in MTC's long-term planning;
- Increase the involvement of often underrepresented people in low-income and minority communities and ensure that their voices are heard; and
- Complement the simultaneous process of the County Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) as they develop lists of projects to submit for inclusion in the Transportation 2030 Plan.

The outreach program was conducted in three phases.

Phase One

MTC conducted an extensive public involvement program to solicit input from June to December 2003. The program included a daylong regional "kickoff" summit (attended by more than 450 people from all parts of the Bay Area), a regional telephone poll (with 3,600 eligible voters participating), six focus groups, 30 targeted workshops with specific stakeholder groups and a Web survey (taken by over 530 individuals). In addition, considerable public comment was received at meetings of the Planning and Operations Committee and the full Commission.

Phase Two

Public outreach from January to October 2004 included meetings hosted by the CMAs to get public input on local investment priorities. Phase Two also included public comment on MTC's Equity Analysis (developed in coordination with MTC's Minority Citizens Advisory Committee) for the 2030 Plan and a set of stakeholder meetings to further develop the Transportation/Land Use Platform, the Lifeline Transportation Program and the Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program.

Phase Three

The final phase began in November 2004 with the release of the Draft Transportation 2030 Plan. Phase Three included interactive workshops in November and December 2004, a Web survey (taken by 800 individuals) and written input. In addition, considerable public comment was received at meetings of the Planning and Operations Committee and the full Commission.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

MTC worked with the consultant team to establish performance measures to evaluate five key characteristics of the public outreach and awareness program:

- **Accessibility** of the outreach process to serve diverse geographic, language and ability needs;
- Extent, or **reach**, of the process in involving and informing as many members of the public as possible;
- **Diversity** of participants in the outreach process, and its ability to reflect the broad range of ethnicities, incomes and special needs of the Bay Area;
- **Impact** of public outreach and involvement on the Plan and on the Commission's actions; and
- **Satisfaction** with the outreach process expressed by participants.

The team developed a set of quantifiable indicators for each of these five performance measures. For example, to measure accessibility, the indicators are "Meetings are held in all nine counties," "One hundred percent of meeting locations are accessible by transit," "Meetings are linguistically accessible to one hundred percent of participants," and "All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)."

The evaluation methodology combined primary and secondary research techniques. The principal tool was an evaluation survey distributed through mail to more than a thousand participants in the public outreach and involvement program. About 120 surveys were returned, tabulated and analyzed. Secondary data analysis included a thorough review of the source documents of the Phase One, Two and Three activities, including the summary reports, report appendices, meeting handouts, announcements, flyers, and public notices produced.

KEY FINDINGS

Accessibility

Indicator	Finding
Meetings are held in all nine counties.	Meetings were held in all nine counties during the three phases of public outreach and involvement.
100% of meetings are accessible by transit.	All meetings were accessible by transit. Additionally, shuttle service was provided for Phase One and Phase Three workshops in Marin County.
All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.	All meetings were accessible under the requirements of the ADA Act. Readers and signers were available at the Phase One Summit that kicked off the overall public involvement effort, and available when requested at all subsequent meetings.
Meetings are linguistically accessible to 100% of participants, with three working days advance request for translation.	Spanish and Mandarin translators were available at the Phase One Summit, and available when requested at subsequent meetings. Two targeted workshops during Phase One were conducted entirely in Spanish.

Reach

Indicator	Finding
2,000 or more comments are logged.	More than 3,400 comments were recorded and logged into an extensive database from workshops, MTC Web surveys, focus groups, correspondence received via letters, faxes or emails, and other sources.
2,000 individuals actively participate in the Transportation 2030 outreach and involvement program	More than 1,900 individuals attended workshops or submitted signed, written correspondence to MTC. Another 3,600 individuals participated in a telephone poll and 1,330 individuals participated in two Web surveys.
20,000 visits to the MTC Web site during active periods of the public outreach and involvement program.	More than 46,700 total visits logged on the MTC Transportation 2030 Web site.
Transportation 2030 Plan or elements are mentioned in at least 50 newspaper articles or other print media. Transportation 2030 Plan is mentioned in at least 10 opinion or editorial pieces.	58 articles, 9 opinion and editorial pieces and 26 paid display ads published.
MTC participates in at least 20 radio or TV broadcasts during the update process.	MTC staff conducted a number of interviews with local radio and TV stations. In all, 14 confirmed broadcasts were aired during the Transportation 2030 outreach and involvement program.

Diversity

Indicator	Finding
Demographics of targeted workshop groups roughly mirror the demographics of the Bay Area population	<p>Precise information on the demographics of the targeted workshop groups is not available. Outreach included 8 meetings in low-income neighborhoods, organized in cooperation with community-based organizations selected through a competitive process.</p> <p>Although the evaluation methodology did not include an indicator related to the environmental justice focus of the Plan itself, two program elements are notable in this regard: a town hall on transportation spending in low-income households; and an Access to Mobility Task Force.</p>

Participants represent a cross-section of people of various interests, places of residence, and primary modes of travel	Participants in the outreach process represented a reasonable cross-section of the Bay Area. Use of the Web site allowed individuals from all nine counties who could not attend workshops or meetings to participate in the outreach process.
---	--

Impact

Indicator	Finding
100% of written comments received are logged, analyzed, summarized, and communicated in time for consideration by staff and Commissioners	Findings were recorded and logged into a database, analyzed and summarized. Reports were provided to Commissioners regularly.
100% of written comments are acknowledged so that the person making them knows whether his or her comment is reflected in the outcome of a Commission action, or conversely, why the Commission acted differently.	All letter writers who commented on the Transportation 2030 Plan received a specific letter in reply from MTC. In addition, participants who commented through workshops and the Web site could track results in three ways: overview mailing, attending Commission meetings, and reviewing the MTC Web site. Every correspondent was sent a response from a commissioner or a staff member.

Participant Satisfaction

Indicator	Finding
Accessibility: (Meeting locations, materials presented in appropriate languages for targeted audiences) Adequate notice of the meetings was provided	A large majority of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the meetings were accessible that adequate notice was provided.
Sufficient opportunity to comment	Respondents strongly agreed that there was high- to medium-level opportunity available to participate and provide input.
Understanding of other perspectives and priorities	Most respondents agreed that the outreach process gave them a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities. The workshops, Web site and Commission meetings were places where people could easily see and hear differing viewpoints on a wide variety of transportation topics.
Clear information at an appropriate level of detail	A majority of respondents agreed that information provided on the Web site was clear and helped them understand the planning process. Most respondents agreed that handouts and displays distributed at the workshops and meetings were educational.

Clear understanding of elements that are established policy versus those that are open to public influence	Many respondents expressed concern about understanding transportation funding issues for the Transportation 2030 Plan and the tradeoffs required in the Plan between competing needs.
Quality of the discussion	A majority of respondents who had an opinion agreed that a quality discussion took place. For different workshops, however, the quality of discussion recorded lower levels of agreement. A significant number of respondents did not have an opinion about these statements.
Responsiveness to comments received	While most respondents agreed that they were “heard” by decision-makers, this indicator ranked the lowest among all statements.
Public outreach and involvement made a positive contribution to the Plan	Most respondents agreed that the public outreach process made a positive contribution to the Transportation 2030 Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT RTP

The following recommendations are based on the survey findings reported in the previous section, on comments made by Transportation 2030 participants, and the expertise of consultants. Implementing these recommendations in the next regional transportation plan (RTP) update cycle will build upon the successes of both the 2001 Plan and the 2030 Plan outreach programs and will provide continuing quality improvements in public involvement and collaboration.

Overall

1. Determine early in the process which programs and decisions are open for public influence and which are not, and continue to educate participants on issues related to committed funding and funding streams.
2. Work with the CMAs to create a more integrated RTP public outreach and involvement program. A coordinated, regional transportation plan for the nine-county area requires a single coordinated, regional public involvement program. The public should have a strong, consistent role in the RTP at the county level, in addition to the regional RTP process.
3. Allow adequate time for community participation both between initiating the RTP update process and submitting county project lists and between the submitting of county project lists and developing the draft plan.

Meetings and Workshops

4. Enhance opportunities for meaningful, facilitated discussions between groups with differing viewpoints. The Transportation 2030 outreach program included multi-interest meetings and these should be expanded for the next RTP update.
5. Create more opportunities for outreach participants and decision-makers (staff, agency boards and the Commission) to interact. Include meetings in which one or two Commissioners meet with key stakeholder groups, especially in Phase Two when key tradeoffs must be understood, discussed and decided.
6. Redesign the Commission meetings when the draft RTP is debated and final testimony taken to allow for a more thoughtful and productive dialogue between the public and Commissioners. This could include variations in meeting times and locations, improved presentations of key draft elements, ground rules for public behavior, an improved structure with distinct comment/discussion periods and other topics.
7. Continue to enhance the very successful partnerships with community-based organizations. These partnerships can also expand to include non-meeting based involvement techniques, tailored to the preferences and needs of particular cultures and neighborhoods.
8. Continue to use the MTC advisory committees as ongoing panels for policy/program review so that they are positioned to play a strong, informed role when the RTP process begins. Expand the advisory committee network to include a wider set of interest groups and geographic representatives.
9. Provide more geographic balance for workshops. Early planning will make it easier to meet this performance measure.

MTC Website

10. Continue the use of the MTC Web site to publicize the outreach process, gather input and report progress. The Web site was a big hit in this process, as it was for the 2001 long-range plan, and can continue to expand the number of participants beyond those who can attend meetings and workshops.

Communication

11. Create new and enhanced methods for communicating with outreach participants during Phase Two of the program (after the draft RTP is released) and at the end of the process when the RTP is adopted. This will provide key information to participants about (a) the impact of their involvement and (b) key decisions made by the Commission. It could also serve to gather additional input on important decisions.
12. All flyers and other publicity for workshops must provide notice about the availability of translating services. Translators were available at nearly all workshops in 2003, but potential participants were often not informed that non-English speakers would be welcome and assisted.
13. Use print media and email listservs to report more regularly on progress and key outstanding issues during the RTP process. With transportation such a “hot topic” in the Bay Area, media attention for contested issues can help us get more participation in late-stage outreach activities.
14. Design new outreach publicity strategies to ensure a broader representation of “interests” in the RTP process, such as Bay Area residents and workers.

Page intentionally left blank for formatting purposes.

1. INTRODUCTION

DEFINING THE TRANSPORTATION 2030 PLAN

The Transportation 2030 Plan is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) principal long-range planning document. The Plan has a 25-year horizon and specifies investment strategies for maintaining, managing and improving the surface transportation network in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The Plan determines how MTC will spend nearly \$113 billion in transportation funding that is likely to flow into the region between now and 2030 from local, regional, state and federal sources.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

A critical component of the Transportation 2030 Plan development process was a public outreach and involvement program. The 20-month program built on the values, needs and priorities that MTC heard from the public during the previous 12-month public outreach effort for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Transportation 2030 Plan outreach program focused on three specific goals, based on the principles of MTC's Public Involvement Action Plan (March 2001).

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

MTC worked with the consultant team to establish performance measures to evaluate five key characteristics of the public outreach and awareness program:

- **Accessibility** of the outreach process to serve diverse geographic, language and ability needs;
- Extent, or **reach**, of the process in involving and informing as many members of the public as possible;
- **Diversity** of participants in the outreach process, and its ability to reflect the broad range of ethnicities, incomes and special needs of the Bay Area;
- **Impact** of public outreach and involvement on the Plan and on the Commission's actions; and
- **Satisfaction** with the outreach process expressed by participants.

REPORT OVERVIEW

This evaluation report is intended as a companion piece to the three reports describing the Phase One, Phase Two, and Phase Three public outreach and involvement programs.

Chapter 2 summarizes the outreach activities and the methods used to solicit and understand public comments conducted during Phase One, Phase Two, and Phase Three.

Chapter 3 describes the methods used to evaluate and analyze these outreach efforts and their impact on the planning process. Evaluation findings are based on the five performance measures developed and adopted by MTC.

Chapter 4 summarizes the principal findings of the evaluation.

Chapter 5 includes recommendations for the Commission and MTC planners for the next update of the Bay Area's long-range transportation plan. These findings are based on the lessons learned during the Transportation 2030 outreach process and the comments received during the evaluation.

Page intentionally left blank for formatting purposes.

2. SUMMARY OF OUTREACH APPROACH AND ACTIVITIES

APPROACH TO PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT

The approach to the Transportation 2030 Public Outreach and Involvement Program was based on an analysis of previous planning cycles. Following an assessment of MTC's overall public involvement procedures for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MTC adopted a Public Involvement Action Plan that guided the development of the Transportation 2030 public outreach and involvement program.

The MTC Public Involvement Action Plan was built on the following principles:

- Public participation is a dynamic activity that requires teamwork and commitment at all levels of the MTC organization.
- One size does not fit all—effective public participation strategies must be tailored to fit the audience and the issue.
- Citizen advisory committees can be used to hear and learn from many voices in the Bay Area.
- Engaging the interested citizen in 'regional' transportation issues is challenging, but possible.
- Effective public outreach and involvement requires relationship building.

The Action Plan also described a set of new policy directions and a series of concrete actions to support the guiding principles. These actions addressed procedures for Commission meetings, public noticing, distribution of information packets, and methods for effectively incorporating public comments and feedback into the planning effort.

The Transportation 2030 outreach focused on three specific goals, based on principles laid out in the Action Plan:

- Involve individuals and groups who traditionally have not been involved in transportation planning, in both the development of the Transportation 2030 Plan and in MTC's long-term planning;
- Increase the involvement of often underrepresented people in low-income and minority communities and ensure that their voices are heard; and
- Complement the simultaneous process of the County Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) as they develop lists of projects to submit for inclusion in the Transportation 2030 Plan.

Outreach activities were designed to educate people as well as to solicit their opinions. The educational element was intended to inform participants about the implications involved in adopting the Plan: What are the issues that must be considered in planning the transportation system? What effects will the different choices have on our communities and our region? At the same time, the involvement campaign was designed to make it easy for participants to express their priorities and preferences, both in terms of values and actual projects and programs.

PHASE ONE

MTC conducted an extensive public involvement program to solicit input. Phase One began in June 2003 with a widely attended Summit in San Francisco, and concluded in December 2003 when the Commission set the parameters for regional priorities and local investment decisions. MTC used five primary methods to engage the public in focused input to inform the Commission's Phase One decisions:

- A day-long regional summit held in San Francisco, attended by more than 450 people from throughout the Bay Area nine counties and beyond;
- A telephone poll of 2,700 eligible voters and 900 residents (both eligible voters and non-voters), providing a representative sample of opinion;
- 6 focus groups held around the region to allow more in-depth discussion on major choices and tradeoffs;
- About 30 targeted workshops held with specific groups and organizations with interests in transportation issues (including 8 meetings held in low-income neighborhoods in cooperation with community-based organizations selected through a competitive process); and
- An interactive Web site survey (Budget Challenge) that included a budget allocation exercise completed by over 530 individuals. The Budget Challenge was open to the public.

These five methods, in combination with public attendance at Planning and Operations Committee and full Commission meetings, balanced qualitative public input with statistically valid and representative measures.

PHASE TWO

Public outreach from January to October 2004 included the following elements:

Meetings on County-Level Investment Recommendations

CMAs conducted meetings seeking public input on which projects to submit to MTC for inclusion in the Transportation 2030 Plan. Information about the meetings was posted on MTC's Web site: [www.mtc.ca.gov/Transportation 2030](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/Transportation%2030). CMAs undertook a range of outreach strategies and provided documentation about their outreach activities to MTC. Candidate projects were due to MTC at the end of May 2004.

Equity Analysis

MTC staff worked with the MTC Minority Citizens Advisory Committee (MCAC) and an MCAC subcommittee to analyze options for the principal methodology components of the equity analysis for the Transportation 2030 Plan. The equity analysis measures both the benefits and the burdens associated with the transportation investment packages proposed for the Transportation 2030 Plan. This helps ensure that minority and low-income communities share in the benefits of the transportation network without bearing a disproportionate share of the burdens.

In 10 meetings between February and September 2004, committee members met to review the methodology and:

- Define the minority and low-income communities of concern, using available Census data;
- Determine the essential destinations to be used in determining access and travel time associated with Transportation 2030 alternatives;
- Provide input on vehicle miles traveled and emissions.

Multi-Interest Meetings

Staff conducted a series of meetings seeking advice from a range of interests to build agreement on how to advance Commission actions taken in December 2003 with respect to Bicycle/Pedestrian and Lifeline Transportation funding programs, as well as the five-point Transportation and Land-use Platform.

Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group — Two meetings with bicycle and pedestrian advocates and members of the Bay Area Partnership generated ideas for implementing the Commission’s approved \$200 million Bicycle-Pedestrian Program. This group reached agreement on details of program administration, with the exception of a credit alternative, on which the Commission acted at its April 2004 meeting.

Transportation and Land-Use Task Force — Some 20 interested parties representing a range of interests met to advise staff on options for advancing the Commission-approved Transportation and Land-Use Platform. The first meeting included a tour of the new Fruitvale BART Transit Village. Over subsequent meetings, the group further developed elements of the Platform and explored options for how best to link MTC Resolution 3434 Transit Expansion investments to transit-oriented development. The group continued to meet to discuss the details of the approach until the spring of 2005.

Lifeline Transportation/ Access to Mobility Task Force — A group of interested stakeholders was formed to assist MTC in 1) developing recommendations for investing the approved \$216 million Lifeline Transportation Program and, 2) preparing guidelines for investment of future funds that will be needed to support the Access to Mobility goal approved by the Commission in December 2003. The group met four times and also reviewed the Access to Mobility Program in draft form, prior to its inclusion in the Draft Transportation 2030 Plan.

Advisory Council Workshop on the “Big Tent” — MTC’s Advisory Council hosted a workshop attended by members of MTC’s other advisory committees and other interested members of the public. Participants discussed key transportation investment and policy topics such as roads maintenance, transit capital replacement strategies, transportation technology, regional transit connectivity, biking and walking and high-occupancy/toll (HOT) lanes. The input helped staff craft a proposal for Commission consideration on how to fashion a long-range transportation vision for the region that looks beyond existing financial and policy obstacles.

The Cost of Mobility: A Town Hall on Transportation Spending in Low Income Households — A Town Hall held in September 2004 provided stakeholders with an opportunity to discuss the recently completed research study prepared by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), and share various perspectives on the topic of transportation spending for low-income populations. The Town Hall discussion focused on the following aspects of the study: 1) the need for further research related to affordability, 2) the report’s findings, and 3) identifying next steps to advance this issue.

PHASE THREE

The final phase of outreach began in November 2004 with the release of the Draft Transportation 2030 Plan, and concluded in February 2005 with the adoption of the final Transportation 2030 Plan. Phase Three included workshops in November and December, a Web-based survey (taken by 800 individuals) and collection of written and email comments.

The four workshops, listed below, were attended by approximately 250 individuals.

- Workshop/Public Hearing in San Jose on November 30, 2004 (evening)
- Workshop/Public Hearing in San Rafael on December 2, 2004 (evening)
- MTC Advisory Council Workshop in Oakland on December 8, 2004 (daytime)
- Commission Public Hearing in Oakland on December 15, 2004 (daytime)

The primary purpose of these workshops was to get public input on a set of seven draft investment strategies included in the Transportation 2030 Plan. Although the draft Plan included 14 investment categories, each with associated “Calls to Action,” the following 7 were chosen for consideration at the workshops, based on anticipated interest:

- Potholes Ahead: More Local Road Dollars Needed (street and road maintenance)
- Keeping Trains and Buses Humming (transit maintenance and operations)
- Broadening Access to Mobility (seniors, youth, persons with disabilities)
- Lifeline Transportation Network (low-income individuals)
- Walk and Roll! (walking and biking)
- Enhancing Livability by Connecting Transportation and Land Use
- HOT Network Delivers Congestion Insurance (high-occupancy toll lanes)

Meeting participants prioritized specific “Calls to Actions” within each of these investment strategies (using pennies placed in baskets) and provided comments. Similarly, Web site survey participants were asked to select their top two Calls to Action for each investment strategy (with all 14 investment categories available for comment).

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

MEASURING PERFORMANCE

In order to evaluate the Transportation 2030 Public Outreach and Involvement Program, MTC and its consultant team developed five performance measures and a set of quantifiable indicators.

Accessibility

- Meetings are held in all nine counties.
- One hundred percent of meeting locations are accessible by transit.
- All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- Meetings are linguistically accessible to 100 percent of participants, with three working days advance request for translation. (Meeting announcements will offer translation services with advance notice to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services.)

Reach

- Two thousand or more comments are logged into a comment tracking and response system.
- Two thousand individuals actively participate in the Transportation 2030 outreach and involvement program, as measured by survey responses and meeting attendance (excluding repeat attendance).
- There are 20,000 visits to or “views” of the Transportation 2030 section of the MTC Web-site during active periods of the public outreach and involvement program.
- The Transportation 2030 Plan or elements of it are mentioned in at least 50 newspaper articles or other print media.
- The Transportation 2030 Plan is mentioned in at least ten newspaper opinion or editorial pieces.
- MTC participates in at least 20 radio or television broadcasts during the Transportation 2030 Plan process.

Diversity

- The demographics of targeted workshop groups (age, ethnicity, income, geographic location, disability) roughly mirror the demographics of the Bay Area’s population.
- Participants represent a cross-section of people of various interests, places of residence and primary modes of travel, as reported on evaluation forms distributed at meetings.

Impact

- One hundred percent of written comments received are logged, analyzed, summarized and communicated in time for consideration by staff and Commissioners.
- One hundred percent of the written comments are acknowledged so that the person making them knows whether his or her comment is reflected in the outcome of a Commission action, or conversely, why the Commission acted differently.

Participant Satisfaction

- Sixty percent of Transportation 2030 Plan participants agree that the outreach program met each of the following performance dimensions:
 - Accessibility (meeting locations, materials presented in appropriate languages for targeted audiences, with sufficient advance notice, etc.)
 - Adequate notice of the meetings
 - Sufficient opportunity to comment
 - Clear understanding of items that are established policy versus those that are open to public influence
 - Clear information at an appropriate level of detail
 - Responsiveness to comments received
 - Understanding of other perspectives and differing priorities
 - Quality of the discussion

COLLECTING INFORMATION

The evaluation methodologies combined primary and secondary research techniques to determine the extent to which MTC met the above performance measures. The formal evaluation process began in April 2005, after completion and approval of the Draft Transportation 2030 Plan at the February 2005 MTC Commission meeting. The principal tool was an evaluation survey distributed to participants in the public outreach and involvement program.

Secondary data analysis included a thorough review of the meeting records and the source documents of the Phase One, Phase Two, and Phase Three activities. These included the summary reports, report appendices, meeting handouts, announcements, flyers and public notices. The evaluation team also reviewed all newspaper and media pieces published about the Transportation 2030 Plan outreach process.

EVALUATION SURVEY

Participant satisfaction was measured by a detailed evaluation survey conducted in April 2005. The survey was distributed to more than 1,000 participants who had either attended public workshops, participated in online surveys or who had communicated with MTC about the Transportation 2030 Plan via letter, fax or e-mail. Staff developed an expanding mailing list of both postal and e-mail addresses during the outreach process. The mailing list is not entirely representative of Bay Area residents and workers because it was developed from participants who had self-selected themselves to receive mailings from MTC. Rather, it is intended to be understood as an indicator of Transportation 2030 Plan outreach *participant* satisfaction and must be considered in conjunction with the comments and feedback received on the outreach process throughout the 20-month program.

The survey was distributed through the mail. The cover letter for the survey included a brief in-language notice at the bottom informing individuals of the purpose of the survey and instructing them how to obtain a copy in Spanish or Vietnamese. Nearly 110 people responded to the survey.

The survey's five sections asked participants to offer their opinions about how well MTC and the Transportation 2030 Plan outreach process met the performance criteria for participant satisfaction. Responses were tracked for both the overall public outreach and involvement program and for the specific outreach activities conducted during the three phases. Participants were also asked to describe their participation activities. These questions were intended to help MTC understand who was involved in the public outreach program and how they engaged in the process. A final section asked participants to describe their demographic characteristics. Responses to the evaluation survey were also compared to the comments and feedback on the outreach process received during the public outreach and involvement program.

Page intentionally left blank for formatting purposes.

4. KEY FINDINGS

Because the Transportation 2030 Plan is the principal planning document for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, each planning cycle can provide a significant learning opportunity for conducting even more effective public outreach and involvement programs. The following findings about the outreach process will help determine recommendations for the development process of the next long-range transportation plan.

ACCESSIBILITY

MTC extended its efforts to ensure that meetings were accessible to a broad a range of Bay Area residents. For example, through partnerships with local community organizations, workshops were conducted in neighborhoods where transportation outreach has not traditionally been conducted.

Meetings are held in all nine counties.	Meetings were held in all nine counties during the three phases of public outreach and involvement.			
	<i>County</i>	<i>Phase One Locations</i>	<i>Phase Two Locations</i>	<i>Phase Three Locations</i>
	Alameda	Oakland (15) Pleasanton	Oakland (22)	Oakland (2)
	Contra Costa	Concord		
	Marin	San Rafael		San Rafael
	Napa	Napa		
	San Francisco	San Francisco (6)		
	San Mateo	San Carlos		
	Santa Clara	San Jose (3) Milpitas		San Jose
	Solano	Suisun Vallejo Fairfield		
	Sonoma	Santa Rosa Petaluma		
100% of meetings are accessible by transit.	All meetings were accessible by transit. Additionally, shuttle service was provided for Phase One and Phase Three workshops in Marin County.			
All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.	All meetings were accessible under the requirements of the ADA Act. Readers and signers were available at the Phase One Summit that kicked off the overall public involvement effort, and available when requested at subsequent meetings.			
Meetings are linguistically accessible to 100% of participants.	Translators were available at the Phase One Summit, and available when requested at subsequent meetings. Two targeted workshops during Phase One were conducted entirely in Spanish.			

REACH

2,000 or more comments logged into comment tracking and response system	More than 3,400 comments were recorded and logged into an extensive database from workshops, MTC Web site surveys, focus groups, correspondence received via letters, faxes or emails, and other sources.
2,000 individuals actively participate in outreach program	More than 1,900 individuals attended workshops or submitted signed, written correspondence to MTC. Another 3,600 individuals participated in a telephone poll and 1,330 individuals participated in two Web site surveys.
20,000 visits or 'views' of the MTC website.	The Transportation 2030 portion of the MTC Web site was an enormously popular venue and allowed hundreds of individuals to participate who could not attend meetings due to physical disability, distance, meeting times or other reasons. Responses to the Web site far exceeded MTC expectations, receiving more than 46,700 total hits from June 2003 to adoption of the Plan in February 2005.
<p>Transportation 2030 Plan mentioned in at least 50 newspaper articles and other print media.</p> <p>Transportation 2030 mentioned in at least 10 opinion or editorial pieces</p>	<p>MTC aggressively worked with Bay Area newspapers to disseminate information about the Transportation 2030 Plan process throughout the region. In all, 93 articles and opinion pieces were published—58 of these were articles, 9 were opinion pieces and 26 were paid display ads. Local newspapers published 25 articles related to the Transportation 2030 process during Phase One, 6 articles during Phase Two, and 27 articles during Phase Three. The articles and opinion pieces were published in nearly every major local paper, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Institute of Transportation Studies</i> ▪ <i>San Francisco Bay Crossings</i> ▪ <i>San Rafael Terra Linda News Pointer</i> ▪ <i>Petaluma Argus Courier</i> ▪ <i>East Bay Business Times</i> ▪ <i>Bay Area Monitor</i> ▪ <i>The Ally</i> (newsletter of California Alliance for Jobs) ▪ <i>The San Antonio Unity</i> (Oakland) ▪ <i>Oakland Post</i> ▪ <i>Vallejo News</i> ▪ <i>Commuter Times</i> ▪ <i>Tri-Valley Herald</i> ▪ <i>Staying on Track</i> (newsletter of Bay Rail Alliance) ▪ <i>The San Francisco Examiner</i> ▪ <i>World Journal</i> (Chinese language daily) ▪ <i>Morgan Hill Times</i> ▪ <i>San Jose Mercury News</i> ▪ <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> ▪ <i>San Francisco Business Times</i> ▪ <i>Oakland Tribune</i> ▪ <i>Contra Costa Times</i> ▪ <i>San Mateo Times</i> ▪ <i>Santa Rosa Press Democrat</i> ▪ <i>Fairfield Daily Reporter</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Napa Register</i> ▪ <i>Marin Independent Journal</i> ▪ <i>Vacaville Reporter</i> ▪ <i>Sacramento Bee</i> <p>MTC placed 26 paid announcements in local newspapers to advertise the Phase One Summit and the Phase Three Workshops, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>San Francisco Bay View</i> ▪ <i>El Observador</i> ▪ <i>India West</i> ▪ <i>Viet Nam Daily News</i> ▪ <i>Oakland Tribune</i> ▪ <i>San Mateo County Times</i> ▪ <i>Milpitas Post</i> ▪ <i>Vallejo Times - Herald</i>
MTC participates in at least 20 radio or TV broadcasts	MTC staff conducted a number of interviews with local radio and television stations. It was not always possible to document which of these interviews were actually broadcast. In all, 14 confirmed broadcasts were aired during the public outreach and involvement program.

DIVERSITY

<p>Demographics of targeted workshop groups roughly mirror the demographics of the Bay Area.</p>	<p>Precise information on the demographics of the targeted workshop groups is not available. Outreach included 8 meetings in low-income neighborhoods, organized in cooperation with community-based organizations selected through a competitive process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monument Corridor in Concord (heavily Hispanic suburban neighborhood; meeting conducted entirely in Spanish) 2. Tenderloin neighborhood in San Francisco (Vietnamese translation provided) 3. East Oakland (heavily African American neighborhood; Spanish translation also provided) 4. San Francisco Bay View/Hunter's Point (primarily African American urban community) 5. Sunnyhills neighborhood of Milpitas (suburban area; Spanish translation provided) 6. San Antonio neighborhood of Oakland (diverse urban neighborhood; Spanish, Cantonese, Vietnamese translations provided) 7. Canal neighborhood of San Rafael (diverse community; Spanish and Vietnamese translations provided at meeting; shuttle provided to African American neighborhood nearby) 8. Mayfair neighborhood in East San Jose (urban neighborhood; meeting conducted entirely in Spanish) <p>Although the evaluation methodology did not include an indicator related to the environmental justice focus of the Plan itself, two program elements are notable in this regard: a town hall on transportation spending in low-income households and Access to Mobility Task Force.</p>
<p>Participants represent a cross-section of people of various interests, places of residents, and primary modes of travel.</p>	<p>Participants in the outreach process represented a reasonable cross-section of the Bay Area. Use of the Web site allowed individuals from all nine counties who could not attend workshops or meetings to participate in the outreach process.</p> <p>The workshops targeted a wide spectrum of stakeholders, including community groups working in low-income and minority neighborhoods, bicycle advocates, business/construction coalitions, non-profit groups advocating for smart growth and environmental issues, and the League of Women Voters.</p> <p>Phase Two working groups included pedestrian and bicycle advocates, developers and environmental advocates as well as social service agencies and nonprofit organizations working on environmental justice concerns and to help individuals make the transition from welfare to work.</p> <p>MTC's three citizen advisory committees were involved throughout the development of the Transportation 2030 Plan. The advisory committees' membership reflects a wide range of interests.</p> <p>Based on the data from the post-Transportation 2030 evaluation survey, participants had the characteristics listed below (Note: This mail-in survey is not representative of the overall population that took part in the Transportation 2030 process).</p> <p>Race/ethnicity does not total 100 percent because respondents were asked to indicate all that applied.</p>

*Characteristics of Respondents to post-Transportation 2030 Evaluation Survey***Mode of Travel**

40% auto users
60% transit users
(1-2 days a week)

Gender

75% male
25% female

Age

2% age 24 years and under
57% age 25 to 59 years
41% age 60 years and older

Race and Ethnicity

78% White
3% Hispanic/Latino
5% Black/African American
1% Asian Indian
6% Chinese
1% Filipino
1% Japanese
1% Vietnamese
0% Other Asian/Pacific Islander
2% American Indian/Alaskan Native
6% Other race

IMPACT

100% of written comments received are logged into a comment tracking and response system, analyzed, summarized, and communicated in time for consideration by staff and Commissioners

Findings were recorded and logged into a database, analyzed and summarized. Reports were provided to Commissioners regularly, as shown below:

- July 11, 2003 POC meeting: A summary of the comments heard and findings from the June 14, 2003 summit provided.
- Oct. 29, 2003 Commission meeting: Commissioners received results of telephone poll of Bay Area eligible voters and residents.
- Commission workshop held Oct. 29-30, 2003: Commissioners briefed on public and stakeholder feedback to date.
- Nov. 13, 2003 POC meeting: Commissioners presented with a written comprehensive summary of issues and the reaction received to date from a broad cross section of interests involved with the Phase 1 outreach program.
- Dec. 12, 2003 POC meeting: Phase 1 Public Involvement Summary; Commissioners provided written comprehensive analysis of comments received, updated to reflect meetings held since presentation on Nov. 13, 2003.
- March 5, 2004 Planning and Operations Committee and April 14, 2004 Programming and Allocations Committee meetings: Staff updated Commissioners on efforts to define the Bicycle/Pedestrian Program structure; reported on the work of the task force assisting with this program; and sought the committee's direction on key issues.
- July 9, 2004 POC meeting: Staff updated Commissioners on stakeholder discussions regarding the Lifeline Transportation Program, and sought the committee's direction on key issues.
- Jan. 14, 2005 POC meeting: Commissioners presented with summary of the key messages heard from transportation partners, advisory committees, stakeholders, and workshop participants during Phase 3 of the public involvement program.

100% of written comments are acknowledged so that the person making them knows whether his/her comment is reflected in the outcome of a Commission action, or conversely, why the Commission acted differently.	All letter writers who commented on the Transportation 2030 Plan received a specific letter in reply from MTC. In addition, participants who commented through workshops and the Web site were able to track results in three ways: overview mailing, attending Commission meetings and the MTC web site. Every correspondent was sent a response from a commissioner or a staff member.
---	--

PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION

Performance Measures

- In the evaluation survey distributed at the end of the public outreach and involvement program the performance indicators were measured using an agreement scale. This scale allowed the survey to better target respondents' personal experiences.
- The following findings list the mean score for each of the survey questions. Scores are based on a four-point scale:
 - 4 = Strongly agree
 - 3 = Agree
 - 2 = Disagree
 - 1 = Strongly disagree
- Those respondents indicating *no opinion* were not included in the calculation of mean score. **When the means are calculated, the statements that had the greatest agreement scored above 3.0. Statements with medium-level support scored from 2.7 to 3.0. Statements with the lowest level of support scored below 2.7.**
- A full listing of the questions and responses to the survey is included in the Appendix.

Findings

110 people responded to the evaluation survey distributed through the mail. Overall, respondents expressed their strongest satisfaction with accessibility of meetings, the materials and noticing for meetings and workshops. Respondents expressed less satisfaction with the quality of the discussions and the impact of their input on the decision-making process. The survey results are summarized below, according to the key performance measures.

Accessibility & Noticing

Accessibility: (Meeting locations, materials presented in appropriate languages for targeted audiences) Adequate notice of the meetings was provided	A large majority of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the meetings were accessible and that adequate notice was provided.	
	<i>Evaluation Survey Results</i>	
	The meetings and related materials were accessible.	3.18
	Adequate notice of meetings was provided.	3.12

Opportunity to Comment

Sufficient opportunity to comment	Respondents strongly agreed that there was high- to medium-level of opportunity available to participate and provide input.	
	<i>Evaluation Survey Results</i>	
	I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments.	2.98

Education and Learning

Understanding of other perspectives and priorities	Most respondents agreed that the outreach process gave them a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities. The workshops, Web site and Commission meetings were places where people could easily see and hear differing viewpoints on a wide variety of transportation topics.	
	<i>Evaluation Survey Results</i>	
	I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.	3.05

Clarity of Information and Materials

Clear information at an appropriate level of detail	A majority of respondents agreed that information provided on the Web site was clear and helped them understand the planning process. Most respondents agreed that handouts and displays distributed at the workshops and meetings were educational.	
	<i>Evaluation Survey Results</i>	
	The MTC Web site provided clear information on the Plan and was useful for participating in the planning process.	2.83
	The handouts and displays were educational.	3.0

Clear understanding of elements that are established policy versus those that are open to public influence	Many respondents expressed concern about understanding transportation funding issues for the Transportation 2030 Plan and the tradeoffs required in the Plan between competing needs.	
	<i>Evaluation Survey Results</i>	
	I understood what policy areas of the Plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	2.78

Quality of Discussion

Quality of the discussion	A majority of respondents who had an opinion agreed that a quality discussion took place. However, the quality of discussion recorded lower levels of agreement for different workshops. A significant number of respondents did not have an opinion about these statements.	
	<i>Evaluation Survey Results</i>	
	MTC did a good job of involving the public.	2.87
	A quality discussion took place.	2.71

Responsiveness and Impact

Responsiveness to comments received.	While most respondents agree that they were “heard” by decision-makers, this statement ranked below average; the lowest among all statements. About 22% of the respondents disagreed with the statement.	
Public outreach and involvement made a positive contribution to the Transportation 2030 Plan.	Most respondents agreed that the public outreach process made a positive contribution to the Transportation 2030 Plan. A significant number of respondents did not have an opinion about these statements.	
	<i>Evaluation Survey Results</i>	
	Felt like my comments were heard.	2.60
	Public outreach and involvement made a positive contribution to the Transportation 2030 Plan.	2.99

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT RTP

The following recommendations are based on the survey findings reported in the previous section, on comments made by Transportation 2030 participants, and the expertise of consultants. Implementing these recommendations in the next regional transportation plan (RTP) update cycle will build upon the successes of both the 2001 Plan and the 2030 Plan outreach programs and will provide continuing quality improvements in public involvement and collaboration.

OVERALL

1. Determine early in the process which programs and decisions are open for public influence and which are not, and continue to educate participants on issues related to committed funding and funding streams.
2. Work with the CMAs to create a more integrated RTP public outreach and involvement program. A coordinated, regional transportation plan for the nine-county area requires a single coordinated, regional public involvement program. The public should have a strong, consistent role in the RTP at the county level, in addition to the regional RTP process.
3. Allow adequate time for community participation both between initiating the RTP update process and submitting county project lists and between the submitting of county project lists and developing the draft plan.

MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

4. Enhance opportunities for meaningful, facilitated discussions between groups with differing viewpoints. The Transportation 2030 outreach program included multi-interest meetings and these should be expanded for the next RTP update.
5. Create more opportunities for outreach participants and decision-makers (staff, agency boards and the Commission) to interact. Include meetings in which one or two Commissioners meet with key stakeholder groups, especially in Phase Two when key tradeoffs must be understood, discussed and decided.
6. Redesign the Commission meetings when the draft RTP is debated and final testimony taken to allow for a more thoughtful and productive dialogue between the public and Commissioners. This could include variations in meeting times and locations, improved presentations of key draft elements, ground rules for public behavior, an improved structure with distinct comment/discussion periods and other topics.
7. Continue to enhance the very successful partnerships with community-based organizations. These partnerships can also expand to include non-meeting based involvement techniques, tailored to the preferences and needs of particular cultures and neighborhoods.
8. Continue to use the MTC advisory committees as ongoing panels for policy/program review so that they are positioned to play a strong, informed role when the RTP process begins. Expand the advisory committee network to include a wider set of interest groups and geographic representatives.

9. Provide more geographic balance for workshops. Early planning will make it easier to meet this performance measure.

MTC WEBSITE

10. Continue the use of the MTC Web site to publicize the outreach process, gather input and report progress. The Web site was a big hit in this process, as it was for the 2001 long-range plan, and can continue to expand the number of participants beyond those who can attend meetings and workshops.

COMMUNICATION

11. Create new and enhanced methods for communicating with outreach participants during Phase Two of the program (after the draft RTP is released) and at the end of the process when the RTP is adopted. This will provide key information to participants about (a) the impact of their involvement and (b) key decisions made by the Commission. It could also serve to gather additional input on important decisions.
12. All flyers and other publicity for workshops must provide notice about the availability of translating services. Translators were available at nearly all workshops in 2003, but potential participants were often not informed that non-English speakers would be welcome and assisted.
13. Use print media and email listservs to report more regularly on progress and key outstanding issues during the RTP process. With transportation such a “hot topic” in the Bay Area, media attention for contested issues can help us get more participation in late-stage outreach activities.
14. Design new outreach publicity strategies to ensure a broader representation of “interests” in the RTP process, such as Bay Area residents and workers.

APPENDIX

- Evaluation Survey Cover Letter
- Evaluation Survey Instrument
- Evaluation Survey Instrument in Spanish and Vietnamese
- Evaluation Survey Results
- Comments from the Evaluation Survey



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel.: 510.464.7700
TTY/TDD: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848
e-mail: info@mtc.ca.gov
Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov

April 2005

Help us improve our outreach and public involvement!

Thank you for your participation in developing the Transportation 2030 Plan, the Bay Area's long-range transportation plan that specifies the investments and strategies necessary to maintain, manage and improve the region's roads, freeways, public transit, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The plan was adopted by the Commission in February 2005 after a three-phase planning process over some 20 months with extensive public involvement.

More than 6,000 people contributed to the plan by attending meetings and workshops, writing letters, responding to surveys and in many other ways. You may recall attending a workshop and giving us your ideas and priorities.

The feedback we received was invaluable. The long-range plan is updated every three years to reflect new planning priorities and changing projections of growth and travel demand. Now, once again, we are looking for ways to improve our public involvement programs, specifically how to involve the public in the development of the next plan.

Please take a few minutes to fill out the enclosed survey and return it as directed below. Your individual replies will be collected and reviewed by an independent evaluator. MTC will keep all replies confidential and aggregated for review.

When you are finished, simply fold the survey back to the way you received it, secure the edges with tape (no staples, please) and drop it in the mail.

Please respond by April 29, 2005.

Usted recibió esta encuesta porque usted participó en las reuniones sobre el plan de transporte de distancias largas Transportation 2030. Por favor ayúdenos a mejorar nuestro alcance y involucramiento público a su comunidad. Si a usted le gustaría esta encuesta en español, por favor llame al 510/464-7783.

Quý vị đã nhận được bản thăm dò này vì quý vị có tham dự vào buổi họp hội thảo về Kế hoạch Vận chuyển dài hạn cho tới năm 2030 (Transportation 2030 long-range transportation plan). Xin giúp chúng tôi cải tiến quan hệ đối ngoại và sự tham gia của cộng đồng của quý vị. Nếu muốn có bản tài liệu này bằng tiếng Việt, [hay tiếng Tây Ban Nha] xin gọi điện thoại số 510/464.7808.

Thank you!

Jon Rubin, Chair
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

John McLemore, Vice Chair
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Ammiano
City and County of San Francisco

Irma Anderson
Cities of Contra Costa County

Tom Azunbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

James T. Beall Jr.
Santa Clara County

Bob Blanchard
Sonoma County and Cities

Mark DeSaulnier
Contra Costa County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sue Lempert
Cities of San Mateo County

Michael D. Nevin
San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Pamela Torliatt
Association of Bay Area Governments

Sbelia Young
Cities of Alameda County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Director/Operations

Therese W. McMillan
Deputy Director/Policy

2030 Public Involvement Survey

April 2005

Please place an "X" in the space that best describes your agreement with the following statements ▶

A. Overall Transportation 2030 Public Involvement Process

1. Please rate the following statements based on your evaluation of the overall outreach process.

- The meeting and related materials were accessible.
- Adequate notice of meetings was provided.
- I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments.
- I understood what policy areas of the plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.
- I felt like my comments were heard.
- I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.
- A quality discussion took place.
- The MTC website provided clear information on the plan and was useful for participating in the planning process.
- MTC did a good job of involving the public.
- Public outreach and involvement made a positive contribution to the Transportation 2030 Plan.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Do you have any other comments about the overall outreach process?

B. Phase II Public Involvement: Multi-Interest Meetings

1. Did you participate in any of the following meetings or workshops in Phase II? (Check all that apply).

- ☐ MTC Minority Citizens Advisory Committee (MCAC) meetings to discuss the Equity Analysis (February to September 2004)
- ☐ Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group meetings (February 2004)
- ☐ Transportation and Land Use Task Force meetings (April 2004 and ongoing)
- ☐ Lifeline Transportation/Access to Mobility Task Force meetings (March to July 2004)
- ☐ Advisory Council Workshop on the "Big Tent" (August 11, 2004)
- ☐ The Cost of Mobility: A "Town Hall" Meeting on Transportation Spending in Low Income Households (September 15, 2004)

continued from inside

E. Optional

MTC strives to include the broad diversity of the Bay Area in all of its planning efforts. Please answer the following questions to help us better understand the effectiveness of our outreach process.

- Do you use public transit regularly (at least 1-2 times a week)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- What is your zip code?
- Indicate your gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
- Indicate your age range: ☐ 24 years and under ☐ 25 to 39 years ☐ 60 years and older
- Are you Hispanic/Latino? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- What is your race/ethnicity? Check all that apply:

- ☐ White/Caucasian
- ☐ Black/African American
- ☐ Asian Indian
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Filipino
- ☐ Japanese
- ☐ Vietnamese
- ☐ Other Asian/Pacific Islander
- ☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native
- ☐ Other

Thank You!!

▶ Please fold the survey along the dotted line, so the postal address faces outward. Place tape where indicated and drop it in the mail. An independent evaluator will tabulate your responses.



Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth St.
Oakland, CA 94607-9965

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 689 OAKLAND, CA

Place Tape Here



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED
STATES

*continued
from front*

2. Please rate the following statements based on your evaluation of meetings and workshops in Phase II.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The meeting and related materials were accessible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequate notice was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The information presented was clear with an appropriate level of detail.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understood what policy areas of the plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The layouts and displays were educational.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt like my comments were heard.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A quality discussion took place.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Do you have any other comments regarding meetings and workshops in Phase II?

C. Phase III Outreach: Reviewing the Draft 2030 Plan

1. Did you participate in any of the following meetings or workshops in Phase III? (Check all that apply.)
- ☐ Public workshop, San Jose/Santa Clara County, Martin Luther King, Jr. Library (November 30, 2004)
 - ☐ Public workshop, San Rafael/Marin County, Marin Center Exhibit Hall (December 2, 2004)
 - ☐ MTC Advisory Council Workshop, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland (December 8, 2004)
 - ☐ MTC Commission Public Hearing, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland (December 15, 2004)

2. Please rate the following statements based on your evaluation of meetings and workshops in Phase III.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The meeting and related materials were accessible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequate notice was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The information presented was clear with an appropriate level of detail.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understood what policy areas of the plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The layouts and displays were educational.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt like my comments were heard.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A quality discussion took place.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Do you have any other comments regarding meetings and workshops in Phase III?

4. Did you participate in the following web survey?
Transportation 2030 Web Survey: You Make the Call (November–December 2004)
- ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Please rate the following statements based on your evaluation of the web survey in Phase III.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The survey was accessible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The survey was adequately publicized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The information presented was clear with an appropriate level of detail.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understood what policy areas of the plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The information provided was educational.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Do you have any other comments regarding the web survey?
-
-

D. Affiliation

1. Who were you representing at meetings and workshops or when you responded to a survey?
Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Private citizen | <input type="checkbox"/> Public transportation agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Transit advocacy group |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community-based organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Private transportation organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Social service agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Labor organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education/school district | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

continued on back



M T C Transportation 2030 Public Involvement Survey



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel.: 510.464.7700
TTY/TDD: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848
e-mail: info@mtc.ca.gov
Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov

Jon Rubin, Chair
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

John McLamore, Vice Chair
Carlsbad, Santa Clara County

Toni Amosiano
City and County of San Francisco

Iraia Anderson
Cities of Contra Costa County

Toni Azanubrada
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

James T. Boall Jr.
Santa Clara County

Bob Blumhardt
Solano County and Cities

Mark DeSaunier
Contra Costa County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giropini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Hakstad
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sue Lenigert
Cities of San Mateo County

Michael D. Nevitt
San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi
State Division, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Sporing
Solano County and Cities

Pamela Vorhies
Association of Bay Area Governments

Sheila Young
City of Alameda County

Steve Heninger
Executive Director

Ann Flamer
Deputy Director/Operations

Theresa W. McMillan
Deputy Director/Policy

Abril 2005

¡Ayúdenos a mejorar nuestro alcance y participación pública!

Gracias por su participación en el desarrollo del Plan de Transporte 2030, el plan a largo plazo de transporte del Área de la Bahía que especifica las inversiones y estrategias necesarias para mantener, manejar y mejorar las carreteras, las vías rápidas, el transporte público y las adecuaciones para peatones y bicicletas en la región. El plan se adoptó por la Comisión en febrero del 2005, después de un proceso de planificación de tres fases con gran participación pública durante unos 20 meses.

Más de 6,000 personas contribuyeron al plan asistiendo a reuniones y talleres, escribiendo cartas, respondiendo a encuestas y de muchas otras maneras. Tal vez usted recuerde haber asistido a un taller y haber aportado sus ideas y prioridades.

Las ideas y opiniones que recibimos no tienen precio. El plan a largo plazo se actualiza cada tres años para reflejar nuevas prioridades de planificación, cambiar proyecciones de crecimiento y demandas de viajes. Ahora, una vez más, estamos buscando maneras de mejorar nuestros programas de participación pública, específicamente la manera de obtener la participación del público en el desarrollo del siguiente plan.

Por favor, tómese unos minutos para llenar nuestra encuesta adjunta y regrésela como se explica abajo. Sus respuestas individuales serán recopiladas y revisadas por un evaluador independiente. La MTC mantendrá de forma confidencial todas las respuestas y las archivará para revisarlas en su conjunto.

Cuando termine, simplemente doble la carta de la manera en que la recibió, asegure las orillas con cinta (no use grapas, por favor) y déjela en el correo.

Por favor responda antes del 9 de mayo de 2005.

¡Gracias!

continuación de la
parte de adentro

E. Opcional

MTC se esfuerza por incluir la amplia diversidad del Área de la Bahía en todos sus planes. Por favor responda a las siguientes preguntas para ayudarnos a entender mejor la diversidad de nuestro proceso de alcance.

1. ¿Ha regulado el transporte público? (por lo menos 1-2 veces a la semana) ☐ SI ☐ No

2. ¿Cuál es su código postal?

3. Indique su género: ☐ Masculino ☐ Femenino

4. Indique su rango de edad: ☐ 14 años o menor ☐ 25 a 59 años ☐ 60 años o mayor

5. ¿Ha unido Hispano/Latino? ☐ SI ☐ No

6. ¿Cuál es su raza/etnia? Marque todas las que apliquen:

- ☐ Blanco ☐ Negro/Afroamericano ☐ Japonesa ☐ Otro
- ☐ Indio nativo ☐ Vietnamita ☐ Otra Asiatico/Indio del Pacifico
- ☐ Chino ☐ Indio Americano/Nativo de Alaska
- ☐ Filipino

¡Gracias!

Sírvase devolver la encuesta
en el sobre adjunto con porte pagado

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

TRANSPORTATION 2030 Participación Pública Encuesta

Abril 2005

A. Proceso General de Participación Pública en el Plan Transporte 2030

1. Por favor clasifique los siguientes enunciados basándose en su evaluación del proceso general de alcance:

	Tratamiento de acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Tratamiento en desacuerdo	Sin opinión
La reunión y los materiales relacionados fueron accesibles.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Se proporcionó notificación apropiada acerca de las reuniones.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tuve oportunidad suficiente para proporcionar comentarios.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Entendí cuáles áreas de política del plan estaban abiertas para la discusión y el debate a diferencia de aquellas que eran de política establecida.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sentí que mis comentarios fueron escuchados.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Obtengo un mejor entendimiento sobre las perspectivas y prioridades de la demás persona.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Se formó una discusión de calidad.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
El sitio web de MTC proporcionó información clara acerca del plan y fue útil en la participación en el proceso de planeación.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
La MTC hizo un buen trabajo involucrando al público.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
El alcance y la participación pública tuvieron una contribución importante en el Plan de Transporte 2030.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. ¿Tiene algún otro comentario acerca del proceso general de alcance?

B. Participación Pública en la Fase II: Reuniones de intereses múltiples

1. ¿Participó en alguna de las siguientes reuniones o talleres en la Fase II? (Marque todos los que apliquen).

- ☐ Reuniones del Comité Consultor de Ciudadanos Minoritarios de la MTC (MCAAC) para estudiar el Análisis de Equidad (diciembre a septiembre 2004).
- ☐ Reuniones regionales de los grupos de trabajo sobre bicicletas y peatones (diciembre 2004).
- ☐ Reuniones del Equipo de Trabajo sobre Transporte y Uso de Suelo (abril 2004 en adelante).
- ☐ Reuniones del Equipo de Trabajo sobre Servicios de Transporte LifeLine y Acceso a Movilidad (marzo a julio 2004).
- ☐ Taller del Consejo Consultor sobre el "Big Tent" (aspectos globales del plan).
- ☐ El Costo de la Movilidad: Una reunión sobre gastos de transporte en los hogares de bajos ingresos (1.5 de septiembre 2004).



continuación del
anverso

2. Por favor califique los siguientes enunciados basándose en su evaluación de las reuniones y los talleres en la Fase II:

La reunión y los materiales relacionados fueron accesibles.
Se proporcionó notificación adecuada acerca de las reuniones.
Tiene oportunidad suficiente para proporcionar comentarios.
La información presentada fue clara con un nivel adecuado de detalles.

Entendí cuáles áreas de política del plan estaban abiertas para la discusión y el debate; a diferencia de aquellas que eran de política establecida.

Los folletos y desplegados fueron educativos.
Sentí que mis comentarios fueron escuchados.
Obtuve un mejor entendimiento acerca de las perspectivas y prioridades de las demás personas.
Se formó una discusión de calidad.

	Tratamiento de acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Tratamiento en desacuerdo	Sin opinión
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. ¿Tiene algún otro comentario acerca de las reuniones y los talleres en la Fase II?

C. Alance de la Fase III: Revisando el Borrador del Plan 2030

1. ¿Participó en alguna de las siguientes reuniones o talleres en la Fase III? (Marque todos los que apliquen).
- ☐ Taller público, Condados de San José/Santa Clara, Biblioteca Martin Luther King Jr. (30 de noviembre de 2004).
- ☐ Taller público, Condados de San Rafael/Marin, Marin Center Exhibit Hall (2 de diciembre de 2004).
- ☐ Taller del Consejo Consultivo de la MTC, Joseph B. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland (6 de diciembre de 2004).
- ☐ Audiencia Pública de la MTC, Joseph B. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland (15 de diciembre 2004).

2. Por favor califique los siguientes enunciados basándose en su evaluación de las reuniones y los talleres en la Fase III:

La reunión y los materiales relacionados fueron accesibles.
Se proporcionó notificación adecuada acerca de las reuniones.
Tiene oportunidad suficiente para proporcionar comentarios.
La información presentada fue clara con un nivel adecuado de detalles.

Entendí cuáles áreas de política del plan estaban abiertas para la discusión y el debate; a diferencia de aquellas que eran de política establecida.

Los folletos y desplegados fueron educativos.
Sentí que mis comentarios fueron escuchados.
Obtuve un mejor entendimiento acerca de las perspectivas y prioridades de las demás personas.
Se formó una discusión de calidad.

	Tratamiento de acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Tratamiento en desacuerdo	Sin opinión
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. ¿Tiene algún otro comentario acerca de las reuniones y los talleres en la Fase III?

4. ¿Participó en la siguiente encuesta en línea?
- Encuesta del Transporte 2030 en línea: Vivid Decide (noviembre - diciembre 2004)
- ☐ Sí ☐ No

5. Por favor califique los siguientes enunciados basándose en su evaluación de la encuesta en línea en la Fase III:

La encuesta fue accesible.
La encuesta fue publicada adecuadamente.
La información presentada fue clara con un nivel adecuado de detalles.
Entendí cuáles áreas de política del plan estaban abiertas para la discusión y el debate; a diferencia de aquellas que eran de política establecida.
La información proporcionada fue educativa.

	Tratamiento de acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Tratamiento en desacuerdo	Sin opinión
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. ¿Tiene algún otro comentario respecto a la encuesta en línea?

D. Afiliación

1. ¿A quién representaba usted en las reuniones y talleres o en el momento de contestar esta encuesta?

(Marque todos los que apliquen).

☐ Ciudadano particular ☐ Agencia de transporte público ☐ Grupo de abogacía de tránsito

☐ Organización comunitaria ☐ Organización de transporte privado ☐ Agencia de servicios sociales

☐ Organización de negocios ☐ Organización ambiental ☐ Organización laboral

☐ Dentro de la educación/escolar ☐ Otro _____

continúa al reverso



MTC Transportation 2030 Public Involvement Survey



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel.: 510.464.7700
TTY/TDD: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848
e-mail: info@mtc.ca.gov
Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov

Jon Rubin, Chair
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

John McLemore, Vice Chair
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Ammann
City and County of San Francisco

Irina Anderson
Cities of Contra Costa County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

James T. Baill Jr.
Santa Clara County

Bob Blanchard
Sonoma County and Cities

Mark DeSaubier
Contra Costa County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Holsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sue Lemport
Cities of San Mateo County

Michael D. Nevitt
San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Sperring
Solano County and Cities

Pamela Tortiatt
Association of Bay Area Governments

Shelia Young
City of Alameda County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Director/Operations

Theresa W. McMillan
Deputy Director/Policy

Tháng 4 năm 2005

Hãy giúp chúng tôi cải tiến quan hệ đối ngoại và sự cộng tác của công chúng

Thành thật cảm ơn quý vị đã có nhấ ý tham dự Cuộc Hội Thảo về Chương Trình Giao Thông năm 2030, một đề án dài hạn cho lưu thông của Vùng Vịnh, nó thể hiện trọng điểm đầu tư và sách lược cần thiết để duy trì, quản lý, và cải tiến hệ thống đường sá, xa lộ, hệ vận tải công cộng trong vùng, cũng như phương tiện vận chuyển cho người đi bộ và xe đạp hai bánh. Kế hoạch này đã được Ủy Hội MTC chấp thuận hồi tháng 2/2005 sau ba giai đoạn khoảng 20 tháng của tiến trình thiết kế, có sự tham gia tích cực của công chúng.

Có hơn 6000 người đã tham gia đóng góp vào kế hoạch qua việc dự họp và hội thảo làm việc, hay biên thư gửi đến, trả lời thư thăm dò của chúng tôi hoặc bằng nhiều cách khác. Quý vị có thể gọi cho chúng tôi để lấy hẹn tham dự một buổi hội thảo công tác để cho chúng tôi ý kiến và các đề xuất ưu tiên.

Ý kiến phản hồi mà chúng tôi nhận được thật là vô giá. Kế hoạch dài hạn này được cập nhật mỗi 3 năm phản ánh được những thiết kế mới có tầm ưu tiên, và thay đổi sự đối chiếu quanh đã phát triển và nhu cầu lưu thông du lịch. Hiện tại một lần nữa, chúng tôi tìm kiếm phương cách hầu cải tiến chương trình công chúng tham gia đóng góp, đặc biệt là sự trực tiếp can dự của quần chúng trong phát triển kế hoạch sắp tới.

Xin quý vị tiết kiệm thời gian trong ít phút để điền khuyết bản thăm dò kèm theo đây và gửi lại cho chúng tôi. Hồi đáp của quý vị sẽ được thu thập và xem xét bởi một người lượng giá độc lập. Ủy hội MTC sẽ bảo quản cẩn mật những ý kiến đóng góp và tập hợp đầy đủ cho sự duyệt xét.

Khi quý vị làm xong, chỉ cần xếp bản thăm dò lại theo như cách có sẵn lúc nhận được và dán cạnh bìa lại (xin đừng đóng đinh ghim stappler), và bỏ vào thùng thư bưu điện.

Hãy vui lòng trả lời cho chúng tôi trước ngày 13 tháng 5, 2005

Thành thật cảm tạ quý vị



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel.: 510.464.7700
TTY/TDD: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848
e-mail: info@mtc.ca.gov
Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov

Jon Rubin, Chair
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

John McLemore, Vice Chair
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Ammann
City and County of San Francisco

Irina Anderson
Cities of Contra Costa County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

James T. Baill Jr.
Santa Clara County

Bob Blanchard
Sonoma County and Cities

Mark DeSautier
Contra Costa County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Holsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sue Lemport
Cities of San Mateo County

Michael D. Nevitt
San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Sperling
Solano County and Cities

Pamela Tortiatt
Association of Bay Area Governments

Shelia Young
City of Alameda County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Director/Operations

Theresa W. McMillan
Deputy Director/Policy

Tháng 4 năm 2005

Hãy giúp chúng tôi cải tiến quan hệ đối ngoại và sự cộng tác của công chúng

Thành thật cảm ơn quý vị đã có nhã ý tham dự Cuộc Hội Thảo về Chương Trình Giao Thông năm 2030, một đề án dài hạn cho lưu thông của Vùng Vịnh, nó thể hiện trọng điểm đầu tư và sách lược cần thiết để duy trì, quản lý, và cải tiến hệ thống đường sá, xa lộ, hệ vận tải công cộng trong vùng, cũng như phương tiện vận chuyển cho người đi bộ và xe đạp hai bánh. Kế hoạch này đã được Ủy Hội MTC chấp thuận hồi tháng 2/2005 sau ba giai đoạn khoảng 20 tháng của tiến trình thiết kế, có sự tham gia tích cực của công chúng.

Có hơn 6000 người đã tham gia đóng góp vào kế hoạch qua việc dự họp và hội thảo làm việc, hay biên thư gửi đến, trả lời thư thăm dò của chúng tôi hoặc bằng nhiều cách khác. Quý vị có thể gọi cho chúng tôi để lấy hẹn tham dự một buổi hội thảo công tác để cho chúng tôi ý kiến và các đề xuất ưu tiên.

Ý kiến phản hồi mà chúng tôi nhận được thật là vô giá. Kế hoạch dài hạn này được cập nhật mỗi 3 năm phản ánh được những thiết kế mới có tầm ưu tiên, và thay đổi sự đối chiếu quanh đã phát triển và nhu cầu lưu thông du lịch. Hiện tại một lần nữa, chúng tôi tìm kiếm phương cách hầu cải tiến chương trình công chúng tham gia đóng góp, đặc biệt là sự trực tiếp can dự của quần chúng trong phát triển kế hoạch sắp tới.

Xin quý vị tiết kiệm thời gian trong ít phút để điền khuyết bản thăm dò kèm theo đây và gửi lại cho chúng tôi. Hồi đáp của quý vị sẽ được thu thập và xem xét bởi một người lượng giá độc lập. Ủy hội MTC sẽ bảo quản cẩn mật những ý kiến đóng góp và tập hợp đầy đủ cho sự duyệt xét.

Khi quý vị làm xong, chỉ cần xếp bản thăm dò lại theo như cách có sẵn lúc nhận được và dán cạnh bìa lại (xin đừng đóng đinh ghim stappler), và bỏ vào thùng thư bưu điện.

Hãy vui lòng trả lời cho chúng tôi trước ngày 13 tháng 5, 2005

Thành thật cảm tạ quý vị

E. Sự Chọn lựa khác

Cơ quan MTC cố gắng bao gồm toàn thể các nhóm cư dân khác biệt ở Vùng Vịnh vào trong kế hoạch phát triển của mình. Xin trả lời các câu hỏi sau đây để giúp chúng tôi am hiểu hơn về các tiến trình và các công chúng.

1. Quy vị có số đúng hai lần chuyển công công không? (1 nhữ 1-2 lần trong tuần) ☐ Có ☐ Không
2. Số Kim Bưu điện (zip code) của quý vị?
3. Giới tính của quý vị? ☐ Nam ☐ Nữ
4. Khoảng tuổi của quý vị? 24 tuổi trở xuống 25 - 39 tuổi 60 tuổi trở lên
5. Quý vị có phải là người gốc Mễ/latino ☐ Phải ☐ Không
6. Cho biết chúng tôi của quý vị? Định dân từ các địa phương

- ☐ Da Trắng
- ☐ Da Đen/ gốc Phi Châu
- ☐ Thổ dân Á Châu
- ☐ Trung Quốc
- ☐ Phi Luật Tân
- ☐ Nhật Bản
- ☐ Việt Nam
- ☐ Người hải đ
- ☐ Da đỏ Mỹ
- ☐ Các chủng

Thành thật cảm tạ quý vị

"Xin vui lòng phúc đáp bản Thăm dò này bằng cách sử dụng bao thư có dán sẵn tem"

TRANSPORTATION

BẢN THẨM DÒ

DỰ LUẬN

Table 4. 2005

A. Tiến trình Can dự của Công chúng Đối với Toàn bộ Chương trình Giao thông 2030

1. Xin đánh giá các nhận định dưới đây theo sự lượng định của quý vị về toàn bộ tiến trình đối ngoại hướng về công chúng:

Cuộc Họp và các vật tư liên hệ có thể tiếp cận và am hiểu được
 Những sự ghi chú thích đáng đã được hội nghị đề ra

Tôi đã có hơi dấy đủ để cung cấp ý kiến phê bình

Tôi hiểu rằng phạm vi chính sách của kế hoạch này vẫn mở
ngõ cho sự thảo luận và tranh biện ngay đối với những người
đã soạn ra nó

Tôi cảm thấy ý kiến của tôi đã được nghe và ghi nhận

Tôi đã đạt được sự am hiểu tốt hơn về tầm nhìn và quan điểm ưu tiên của người khác

Đã có một cuộc thảo luận đầy giá trị tại chỗ hôm nay!

Trang Website của Cơ quan MTC đã cung cấp thông tin rõ ràng và hữu dụng cho những người tham gia hoạch định

MTC đã làm một việc tốt cho sự tham gia của công chúng
Hưởng tới công chúng và sự tham dự của quần chúng đã đóng
số tích cực cho Đề án Giao thông năm 2010

2. Quý vị có những ý kiến nào khác cho toàn diện tiến trình hướng tới quần chúng?

B. Giai đoạn II Công Chúng tham gia : Những buổi họp có nhiều lợi ích

- L. Quý vị có tham gia các cuộc họp hay hội thảo kê dưới đây trong giai đoạn II ? Ghi tất cả những cuộc họp nào có tham dự.

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Ủy ban Cố vấn của Công dân cấp Tiểu số của MTC (MCAC) họp phân tích vấn đề hành đảng (từ tháng 2 đến 9 năm 2004) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Phiên họp làm việc cấp Vùng của Giới Bộ hành và Người Sĩ đàng (Tháng 2 năm 2004) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Phiên họp của Lực lượng Đặc nhiệm về Sĩ đàng đất và Lũu thông (Tháng 4 năm 2004 và còn tiếp hành). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Phiên họp về Giao thông Phục và Đôn sống/Tiếp cận với Sĩ đàng của Lực lượng Đặc nhiệm (Tháng 3 đến tháng 7 năm 2004) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Hội thảo của HN đồng Tư vấn về đề tài " Big Tent " (1 tháng 8, 2004) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Chi phí của Sĩ đàng : Chi phí Vận chuyển Kết số cho Người số Lũu thể Thấp (chỉ đến số 15 tháng 9, 2004) |

tiếp theo trong
đầu

2. Xin đánh giá các nhận định dưới đây theo sự hướng dẫn của quý vị về các cuộc họp và hội thảo trong giai đoạn II :

Cuộc họp và các từ liên hệ có thể tiếp cận và an toàn được

Những sự ghi chú thích đáng đã được hội nghị đề ra

Tôi đã có một dự định để cung cấp ý kiến phê bình

Những thông tin được trình bày khá rõ ràng với mức độ chi tiết thích đáng

Tôi hiểu rằng phạm vi chính sách của kế hoạch này vẫn mở rộng cho sự thảo luận và tranh luận ngay đối với những người đã soạn ra nó

Các tài liệu phân phát và trình bày đều mang tính giáo dục

Tôi cảm thấy ý kiến của tôi đã được nghe và ghi nhận

Tôi đã đạt được sự an toàn tốt hơn về tâm thần và quan điểm tư tưởng của người khác

Đã có một cuộc thảo luận đầy giá trị tại chỗ hội nghị

3. Quý vị có ý kiến nào khác về các buổi họp và hội thảo ở giai đoạn II ?

	Đúng / mạnh mẽ	Đúng /	Không đúng /	Không đúng /	Không có ý kiến
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

C. Giai đoạn III Vượt tới : Tôi duyệt bản thảo của kế hoạch 2030

1. Quý vị có tham gia các cuộc họp và hội thảo kể dưới đây trong giai đoạn III ? Ghi số cả những cuộc họp nào có tham dự

☐ Những buổi họp làm việc chung, ở San Jose/Quận Hạt Santa Clara, ở Thư viện Martin Luther King Jr. (30 tháng 11, 2004)

☐ Những buổi họp làm việc chung, ở San Rafael/Quận Hạt Marin, Trung tâm Triển lãm Marin (2 tháng 12, 2004)

☐ Buổi họp làm việc của Hội đồng Tư vấn MTC, ở Trung tâm Joseph P. Bort, Oakland (8 tháng 12, 2004)

☐ Buổi phiên trần công cộng của Ủy hội MTC, ở Trung tâm Joseph P. Bort, Oakland (15 tháng 12, 2004)

2. Xin đánh giá các nhận định dưới đây theo sự hướng dẫn của quý vị về những cuộc họp và hội thảo làm việc trong giai đoạn III :

Cuộc họp và các từ liên hệ có thể tiếp cận và an toàn được

Những sự ghi chú thích đáng đã được hội nghị đề ra

Tôi đã có một dự định để cung cấp ý kiến phê bình

Những thông tin được trình bày khá rõ ràng với mức độ chi tiết thích đáng

Tôi hiểu rằng phạm vi chính sách của kế hoạch này vẫn mở rộng cho sự thảo luận và tranh luận ngay đối với những người đã soạn ra nó

Các tài liệu phân phát và trình bày đều mang tính giáo dục

Tôi cảm thấy ý kiến của tôi đã được nghe và ghi nhận

Tôi đã đạt được sự an toàn tốt hơn về tâm thần và quan điểm tư tưởng của người khác

Đã có một cuộc thảo luận đầy giá trị tại chỗ hội nghị

	Đúng / mạnh mẽ	Đúng /	Không đúng /	Không đúng /	Không có ý kiến
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Quý vị có ý kiến nào khác về các cuộc họp và hội thảo cho giai đoạn III ?

4. Quý vị có tham dự cuộc thảo luận để đưa ra quan niệm luật định toàn về Trang Web dưới đây ?

« Transportation 2030 Web Survey » Quý vị có gửi điện thoại (tháng 11-12 2004).

☐ Có ☐ Không

5. Xin đánh giá các nhận định dưới đây theo sự hướng dẫn của quý vị về cuộc thảo luận qua mạng luật định toàn trong giai đoạn III :

Cuộc thảo luận có thể tiếp cận được

Cuộc thảo luận đã được quảng bá thích đáng

Thông tin được trình bày rõ ràng với mức độ chi tiết thích đáng

Tôi hiểu rằng phạm vi chính sách của kế hoạch này vẫn mở rộng cho sự thảo luận và tranh luận ngay với những người đã làm ra nó

Thông tin cung cấp có mang tính giáo dục

	Đúng /	Không đúng /	Không đúng /	Không có ý kiến
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Quý vị có ý kiến nào khác về cuộc thảo luận ở trang Web mạng Internet ?

D. Sự Liên kết

1. Quý vị đại diện cho ai trong cuộc họp và hội thảo làm việc hay khi đáp ứng một cuộc thảo luận ở ? Đánh dấu tất cả các đáp ứng.

☐ Tư cách công dân riêng ☐ Cơ quan Văn chuyển công cộng ☐ Nhóm Bận bịu cho gói vận chuyển

☐ Tổ chức Cộng đồng ☐ Cơ quan Văn chuyển Tư ☐ Cơ quan Dịch vụ Xã hội

☐ Tổ chức thương mại ☐ Tổ chức Bảo vệ Môi trường ☐ Tổ chức Lao động

☐ Khu học chính/Trường ☐ Các Tổ chức khác

xem tiếp trang sau



MTC Transportation 2030 Public Involvement Survey

MTC TRANSPORTATION 2030 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

Results

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	Responses
OVERALL OUTREACH PROCESS						
The meeting and related materials were accessible.	26%	50%	6%	3%	15%	118
Adequate notice of meetings was provided.	24%	54%	8%	3%	12%	117
I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments.	19%	49%	11%	5%	15%	118
I understood what policy areas of the Plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	18%	35%	25%	6%	17%	118
I felt like my comments were heard.	9%	39%	19%	10%	23%	118
I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.	17%	46%	10%	2%	25%	118
A quality discussion took place.	14%	27%	23%	6%	30%	118
The MTC website provided clear information on the Plan and was useful for participating in the Planning process.	10%	37%	9%	5%	38%	118
MTC did a good job of involving the public.	19%	38%	17%	7%	19%	118
Public outreach and involvement made a positive contribution to the Transportation 2030 Plan.	21%	36%	12%	5%	25%	118
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	Responses
PHASE TWO MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS						
The meeting and related materials were accessible.	19%	48%	1%	3%	29%	86
Adequate notice was provided.	19%	47%	9%	6%	20%	86
I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments.	12%	47%	6%	3%	33%	86
The information presented was clear with an appropriate level of detail.	19%	33%	14%	3%	31%	86
I understood what policy areas of the Plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	15%	31%	15%	7%	31%	86
The handouts and displays were educational.	15%	49%	5%	2%	29%	86
I felt like my comment were heard.	8%	30%	15%	10%	36%	86
I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.	15%	44%	7%	2%	31%	86
A quality discussion took place.	14%	27%	17%	8%	34%	86

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	Responses
PHASE THREE MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS						
The meeting and related materials were accessible.	22%	52%	3%	5%	19%	79
Adequate notice was provided.	19%	49%	9%	4%	19%	79
I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments.	14%	49%	8%	9%	20%	79
The information presented was clear with an appropriate level of detail.	13%	42%	11%	8%	27%	79
I understood what policy areas of the Plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	13%	38%	13%	8%	29%	79
The handouts and displays were educational.	9%	54%	5%	3%	29%	79
I felt like my comment were heard.	6%	37%	15%	10%	32%	79
I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities.	13%	44%	6%	4%	33%	79
A quality discussion took place.	15%	29%	24%	6%	25%	79
PHASE THREE WEB SURVEY						
The survey was accessible.	22%	52%	3%	5%	18%	87
The survey was adequately publicized.	7%	44%	15%	6%	29%	87
The information presented was clear with an appropriate level of detail.	8%	47%	15%	9%	21%	87
I understood what policy areas of the Plan were open to discussion and debate versus those that were established policy.	10%	37%	17%	9%	26%	87
The information provided was educational.	10%	47%	13%	8%	22%	87

MTC TRANSPORTATION 2030 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

Comments

OVERALL OUTREACH PROCESS

I felt like public opinion was ignored.

Allow space for new ideas and alternative options.

The quality of outreach has increased.

Outreach to a variety of populations for a more balanced discussion. (i.e. experts, low income communities)

A minority of constituents spoke the majority.

Times and locations need to be more accessible.

The commission should consider holding a split vote.

Break up into smaller discussion groups.

Mention SMART.

The newsletter is useful.

The meeting was a waste of time and effort.

Publicize the recertification process.

I had problems accessing the MTC website information.

The political players were disjointed from MTC staff and public.

MTC did a good job.

A broad group of constituents were represented and heard.

Label food ingredients and provide vegetarian options.

Publicize meetings more.

Policies were lumped together.

Allow sufficient time for mailing comments.

I never heard about this process until its final stages.

Provide a high level summary of issues/policies to the public lacking computer access.

Provide information at community based organizations and community/neighborhood meetings.

The venue was too small.

Allow more time for workshops and public comments.

Lack of diversity

I only learned about the meeting from non-profit agency. I never saw any public notice in the newspaper or on buses

PHASE TWO MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

Outreach to a variety of populations for a more balanced discussion. (i.e. experts, low income communities)

Strong advocacy creates factions rather than identifying with the public good.

All the decisions seemed to be made beforehand and the public opinion was ignored.

Set a time limit on the length of discussions.

Allow for modification or elimination of established policies.

MTC does not understand the need for good reliable transportation.

Provide more advanced notice for meetings.

Provide a middle ground between "agree" and "disagree".

PHASE THREE MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

A few dominating participants controlled the discussion.

All the decisions seemed to be made beforehand and the public opinion was ignored.

Outreach to a variety of populations for a more balanced discussion. (i.e. experts, low income communities)

Times and locations need to be more accessible.

Provide a written statement about the evaluation of the proposed commuter train.

I was displeased with the misinformation.

Provide more information on road congestion.

I was impressed with the availability of MTC staff.

The 2030 Plan does not reflect MTC's mission statement.

Alameda needs better bus service.

There was not enough time to vote on the issues.

Provide childcare at meetings.

Allow space for new ideas and alternative options.

Allow more time to reply to mail in comments.

No public transportation from the meeting

The deadlines were extremely short and I felt as though you held these only to placate us. You were going to do what you wanted.

PHASE THREE WEB SURVEY

The web survey was biased, limiting, and skewed.

The website was not user friendly.

I am concerned about the lack of input from individuals without internet access.

Supply more background information.

Include more space for comments.

All the decisions seemed to be made beforehand and the public opinion was ignored.

The web survey worked well.

Public comments were not acknowledged.

The web survey was too long.

Advertise this survey in the community.

The survey has improved from the past.

You didn't give us a space for comments and often times the answer choices didn't include all possible answers.

Did you create the survey just to prove you were right?

No bilingual

Very easy to navigate through